[1st November 1932

(*f*) whether it is a fact that the order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, which they were alleged to have disobeyed was served on them only when they were in the lock-up?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) They were arrested by the police under section 151, Criminal Procedure Code, as there was danger of the commission of offences involving a breach of the peace.

(*c*) No warrant of arrest was obtained by the police as no warrant is required for arrests under section 151, Criminal Procedure Code.

(*d*) They were arrested by the police on 14th August 1931 and remanded by the Subdivisional Magistrate, Ariyalur, on 15th August 1931 pending receipt of the charge-sheet. The first information report and the charge-sheet, dated 16th August 1931 were received by the Subdivisional Magistrate on the same day.

(*e*) It is reported that the police had reasonable cause to think that there was danger of the commission of offences involving a breach of the peace which could be prevented only by the immediate arrest of the persons concerned. There was no irregularity of procedure in arresting these persons under section 151, Criminal Procedure Code, and producing them before a Magistrate without avoidable delay for remand.

(*f*) The arrest on the 14th August 1931 was, as stated above, not made for any disobedience of orders under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code.

Arrest of Mr. Pennadam Somasundaram Pillai and seven others of Udaiyarpalaiyam and the attachment of their properties.

* 259-D *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Pennadam Somasundaram Pillai and seven other respectable and peaceful ryots of Udaiyarpalaiyam zamindari were ordered to be arrested, their properties attached and proclamation of sale issued on the 17th of August 1931;

(*b*) if so, whether any reasons were given by the officer who ordered those proceedings, and if so, what they are;

(*c*) under what provisions of law were the properties ordered to be attached;

(*d*) what the circumstances were that led to this series of proceedings all on one and the same day; and

(*e*) whether any opportunity was given to the said accused to explain their conduct before orders were passed, and if not, why not?

1st November 1932]

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) Arrest warrants and notices under sections 87 and 88, Criminal Procedure Code, were issued on 17th August 1931 to Pennadam Somasundaram Pillai and five other ryots of Udayarpalaiyam zamindari as the police reported that these persons, who were suspected of designing the commission of offences involving a breach of the peace, were absconding.

(*c*) Under section 88, Criminal Procedure Code.

(*d*) The police charge-sheet showed that urgent action was necessary to prevent the commission of offences involving a breach of the peace. The simultaneous issue of arrest warrants and notices under sections 87 and 88, Criminal Procedure Code, was irregular. The irregularity has been pointed out to the District Magistrate.

(*e*) The accused were reported to be absconding and the orders in question were passed to secure their presence.

Regulation of professional qualifications and standards

Alleged irregularities in the Office of the Registrar of the Madras Medical Council.

* 260 *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether grave irregularities have been detected by the Government in the working of the Office of the Registrar of the Madras Medical Council;

(*b*) if so, what the nature of the irregularities is; and

(*c*) what action has been taken, or is proposed to be taken by the Government against those responsible for the same?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Serious irregularities such as falsification of accounts, fabrication and destruction of public records and documents and misappropriation of public funds.

(*c*) The audit report on the accounts of the Madras Medical Council for 1931 which revealed the irregularities referred to above has been communicated to the Council which has been requested to conduct a thorough enquiry into the matter, rectify the irregularities brought to light and submit a report showing the action it has already taken or proposes to take in the matter. The President of the Council has also been asked to expedite the prosecution of the clerk of the office who is apparently responsible for the aforesaid irregularities and report the result of the prosecution. The Government have also asked the Council for its views on the Registrar's responsibility in the matter.